



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/412,459	10/04/1999	NICHOLAS P. VAN BRUNT	A792.12-0006	9671

164 7590 06/21/2002

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.  
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING  
312 SOUTH THIRD STREET  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1002

EXAMINER

KOO, BENJAMIN KIM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3764

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/412,459

Applicant(s)

VAN BRUNT, NICHOLAS P.

Examiner

Benjamin Koo

Art Unit

3764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. Claims 45, 46, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 45 states that air is moved through the outlet port into the lungs of the patient, how is this possible when the outlet port is for releasing fluids and is not connected to the lungs. In claim 46, the phrase "positioned in relation to" does not set forth any metes or bounds, additionally, where does the "humidified air" originate? In claim 52 again, how does a "configuration" cause humidified air travel, where is the source? Claims have been interpreted as best understood by the Examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 11-16, 56, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alferness as set forth in the previous office action, paper no. 7, paragraph 3.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3764

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 6, and 17-55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alferness alone as set forth in the previous office action, paper no. 7, paragraph 5, including a mouth port (22), an outlet port/drain (24), and air supply port (20) but does not explicitly show all the variants in air or force components. However, all the limitations are simply adjusting relative steady state/oscillatory force or air components for slightly different effects. It would have been an obvious choice of design to vary the values of air or force to suit various needs or applications at deemed necessary by the user. Furthermore, it has been held that the mere provision of adjustability is not a patentable advance. *In re Stevens*, 101 USPQ 284 (CCPA 1954).

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/7/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Alferness does not disclose an oscillating air pressure component and a steady state air pressure component. The Examiner refers to bellows (10) that is compressed and decompressed and produces oscillating force on the chest of the patient, and column 4, lines 55-57 that shows a bladder (30) that remains inflated during successive compressions and thereby a constant or steady state force. Applicant argues that the air pressure does not at least partially cancel or counteract the force components. The same pressure applied to bellows naturally supplies air to the mouth piece, so while the force is being physically exerted upon the chest by the bellows, the bellows are simultaneously providing air pressure to the lungs to at least

Art Unit: 3764

partially cancel or counteract the force components of both the bladder and the bellows.

Applicant argues that Alferness does not make oscillating compressive force "effective".

However the term "effective" does not reveal any particular limitation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin Koo whose telephone number is 703-308-2657. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W-F; 9:30-8.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0758 for regular communications and 703-746-4892 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

bk  
June 16, 2002



Michael A. Brown  
Primary Examiner